



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/836,222	04/18/2001	Yoshihiro Nakagawa	1080.1096/JDH	6419
21171	7590	07/28/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PATEL, HARESH N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/836,222

Applicant(s)

NAKAGAWA, YOSHIHIRO

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 are subject to examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 4/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-9 is maintained.

Applicant states (1), "Turner is directed to assigning individuals to predefined security levels for determining whether access to a patient's information should be granted, and if so, the amount of access to be granted (see, paragraphs 22, 25 and 26). That is, Turner is limited to providing access to the patient's information based on the requester's membership to one of the predefined security levels",

"Walker is directed to a preference ranking of experts according to which a request for diagnosis is transmitted such that the patient's data is provided to selected experts (see, FIG. 8A and corresponding text)",

"Black is limited to biometric technology based identity verification offered by different locations (see, col. 4, lines 50-58 and col. 8, lines 31-40)",

"Alisuac is limited to using a passcode of a person for accessing the person's records when the person is conscious and using identifying information of the person if the person is unconscious and does not allow the person to define a desired disclosure procedure (see, paragraph 12)",

" the individual patients in Marchoskv are limited to entering information in their record and granting/denying authorization to others (see, Abstract and paragraph 22). In Marchoskv, a

Art Unit: 2154

central computer (102) executes a security program (114) to limit access to the medical and biographical database (106) and individual medical and biographical records (112) contained therein to health care providers that are authorized by a patient to access the particular patient's medical and biographical record (112) (see, paragraphs 36, 42 and 73). That is, Marchoskv is limited to denying or granting authorization to the patients' records (i.e., the individual patients are not able to define a disclosure procedure to be performed when accessing the information)", etc.

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The teachings of all the cited references used for rejection are not limited to the above-mentioned applicant's assertions. The cited references also teach the relied upon limitations. The claims have been amended that alter the scope of the claimed invention, which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office action). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (2), "limitations related to information disclosure procedure defined by each user", is not taught by the cited references.

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations, "limitations related to information disclosure procedure defined by each user", has been newly added, which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office action). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (3), limitations of claim 7 including, “disclosure procedure storing section freely registered with an authorized person having a right of proceeding with an information disclosure procedure on behalf of the specific individual”, is not taught by the cited references.

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations of claim 7 are rejected using combine teachings of Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky. For example, Turner discloses the disclosure procedure storing section can be freely registered with an authorized person having a right of proceeding with an information disclosure procedure on behalf of the specific individual is transferred for each individual (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26), the disclosure procedure executing section receives the request for disclosing individual information of the specific individual (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26), and executes an information disclosure procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section matching an information disclosure procedure of the authorized person as a procedure for disclosing the corresponding individual information of the specific individual (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26), when the disclosure procedure storing section is registered with the authorized person having the right of proceeding with the information disclosure procedure on behalf of the specific individual is transferred (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26).

Also, the specification of the application under prosecution at lines 2 – 17 of page 17 states, “However, even at an emergency time, the information to be disclosed may be limited by arranging such that the information that is not urgently required and that is confidential like a criminal record and family origin, etc”. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. (please

Art Unit: 2154

refer to the below rejections of this office action for the amended claims). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitations, “the individual information”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim (Please see MPEP 706.03(d)). Since, multiple “individual information” (corresponding individual information, disclosing individual information), is referred by the limitations in the claim.

Claim 9 recites the limitations, “the item”, “the corresponding disclosure procedure”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim (Please see MPEP 706.03(d)). Since, multiple “items” (an item of the information, each item of the information is to be accessed), and multiple “corresponding disclosure procedure” (first user to assign a corresponding disclosure procedure using which item, a corresponding disclosure procedure assigned to an item) exist in the claim, it is not clear which “item” and “corresponding disclosure procedure”, is referred by the limitations in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2154

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner et al. US Publication 2003/0177030, Sep 18, 2003 (Hereinafter Turner) in view of Walker et al., 6,302,844 (Hereinafter Walker), Alisuag 2002/0083192 (Hereinafter Alisuag) and Marchosky, U.S. 2002/029157 (Hereinafter Marchosky).

6. As per claim 1, Turner discloses an individual information managing device (e.g., col.,2, paragraph, 0022) connected to a communication line network (e.g., col.,2, paragraph, 0022), for managing individual information (e.g., col., 2 paragraph 22 – col., 3 paragraph 30) the device comprising:

an individual information storing section in which corresponding individual information (e.g., paragraph, 0022) and corresponding information disclosure items (e.g., col.,2, paragraph, 0022), of each individual is registered (e.g., col.,2, paragraph, 0022),

a disclosure procedure storing section in which an information disclosure procedure assigned for each individual by each individual is registered; and (e.g., col., 2 paragraph 22 – col., 3 paragraph 30),

a disclosure procedure executing section (e.g., col., 2, paragraph, 19, paragraph, 23, col., 2) that receives a request for disclosing individual information a specific individual through the communication line network (e.g., usage of server 12 for information management, col., 2, paragraph, 19, paragraph, 23, col., 2),

Art Unit: 2154

executes an information disclosure procedure (e.g., figure 8, paragraph, 42, col., 5) matching the information disclosure procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section (e.g., figure 8, paragraph, 42, col., 5),

and transmits the individual information corresponding to the information disclosure items of the specific individual (e.g., col., 2, paragraph, 0022) to the communication line network toward an information requesting origin when the information disclosure procedure is satisfied (e.g., paragraph, 24, col., 2).

However, Turner does not specifically mention about having defined information for each specific individual.

Walker discloses the concept of having defined information for each specific individual (e.g., patient preference ranking related to the patient record, col., 14, lines 1 – 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Turner with the teachings of Walker in order to facilitate usage of defined information for each specific individual because the defined information would support providing service to the individual based on the individual's needs.

However, Turner and Walker do not specifically mention about the procedure being provided by each user.

Alisuag discloses the concept of the procedure being provided by each user (e.g., paragraph 12, col., 1, different user providing information, and usage of passcode if patient is conscious, usage of fingerprint if patient is unconscious, figures 1-3 and 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Turner and Walker with the teachings of Alisuag in order

Art Unit: 2154

to facilitate the procedure being provided by each user because the procedure would support providing service to the user based on each user needs. The information related to the procedure would enhance managing information for the individual.

However, Turner, Walker and Alisuag do not specifically mention about the items being assigned in accordance with a selection by a corresponding individual and the information disclosure procedure being defined by each individual.

Marchosky discloses the well-known concept of the items being assigned in accordance with a selection by a corresponding individual (paragraph 22) and the information disclosure procedure being defined by each individual (paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Turner, Walker and Alisuag with the teachings of Marchosky in order to facilitate the items being assigned in accordance with a selection by a corresponding individual and the information disclosure procedure being defined by each individual because the individual would have control on what items to be assigned and what items note to be assigned for the information disclosure procedure. The individual would prepare information disclosure procedure according to his/her own needs which would be used by the information managing device.

7. As per claim 2, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky disclose the claimed limitations as disclosed above. Turner also discloses the individual information storing section is registered with each individual information including a plurality of ranked pieces of information for each individual (e.g., figures 1 and 3), based on an arrangement that each individual assigns a rank to

Art Unit: 2154

each of the plurality of ranked pieces of information that constitute the individual information from among a plurality of ranks (e.g., figures 1 and 3),

the disclosure procedure storing section is registered with an information disclosure procedure according to each rank within each individual assigned by each individual (e.g., figures 1 and 3), and the disclosure procedure executing section receives the request for disclosing the information of the specific individual (e.g., figure 3), and executes an information disclosure procedure stored in the disclosure procedure storing section matching an information disclosure procedure corresponding to a rank for the information of the specific individual of which disclosure request is received (e.g., col., 2, paragraph, 19).

8. As per claim 4, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky disclose the claimed limitations as disclosed above. Turner also discloses the disclosure procedure storing section is registered with a posting procedure assigned by each individual for posting to an individual (e.g., col., 4 paragraph 36 – col., 5 paragraph 39), as a part of an information disclosure procedure for each individual, the disclosure procedure executing section has a disclosure request posting section that receives the request for disclosing the corresponding information of the specific individual (e.g., col., 4 paragraph 36 – col., 5 paragraph 39), posts to the specific individual that there has been a request for disclosing the corresponding individual information, in a posting procedure that matching a corresponding posting procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section (e.g., col., 4 paragraph 36 – col., 5 paragraph 39), and receives an approval for the individual information disclosure from the individual who received the posting (e.g., col., 4 paragraph 36 – col., 5 paragraph 39), and the disclosure procedure

Art Unit: 2154

executing section receives an approval for the individual information disclosure from the disclosure request posting section, and proceeds with the information disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraph, 8, FIG. 6, FIG. 7, col., 4 paragraph 36 – col., 5 paragraph 39).

9. As per claims 5 and 6, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky disclose the claimed limitations as disclosed above. Turner also discloses the disclosure procedure storing section is registered with an authentication procedure assigned by each individual for authenticating each individual (e.g., paragraph, 25, col., 2) as apart of an information disclosure procedure for each individual, the disclosure procedure executing section has an authenticating section (e.g., paragraph, 25, col., 2) after the disclosure procedure executing section has received an approval for the corresponding individual information disclosure of the specific individual from a disclosure request posting section (e.g., paragraph, 25, col., 2).

However, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky do not specifically mention about usage of corresponding authentication procedure.

Marchosky discloses a well-known concept of an authenticating section that receives the request for disclosing the corresponding individual information of the specific individual (e.g., paragraph, 22) and authenticates the specific individual an authentication procedure matching a corresponding authentication procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section (e.g., paragraph, 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky in order to facilitate usage of an authenticating section that receives the request for disclosing the

Art Unit: 2154

corresponding individual information of the specific individual and authenticates the specific individual an authentication procedure matching a corresponding authentication procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section because the because the individual would have control on what items to be assigned and what items note to be assigned for the authentication procedure. The individual would prepare information for the authentication procedure according to his/her own needs which would be used by the information managing device.

10. As per claim 7, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky disclose the claimed limitations as disclosed above. Turner also discloses the disclosure procedure storing section can be freely registered with an authorized person having a right of proceeding with an information disclosure procedure on behalf of the specific individual is transferred for each individual (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26), the disclosure procedure executing section receives the request for disclosing individual information of the specific individual (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26), and executes an information disclosure procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section matching an information disclosure procedure of the authorized person as a procedure for disclosing the corresponding individual information of the specific individual (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26), when the disclosure procedure storing section is registered with the authorized person having the right of proceeding with the information disclosure procedure on behalf of the specific individual is transferred (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26).

Art Unit: 2154

11. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner in view of Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky and Platenghe, Cris. T Eurpean patent application, EP 0950972, 4/14/1999 (Hereinafter Platenghe).

12. As per claim 3, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky disclose the claimed limitations as disclosed above. Turner also discloses the disclosure procedure storing section is registered with an information disclosure procedure at a normal time for each individual assigned by each individual (e.g., paragraph, 23).

However, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky do not specifically mention about handling a request at an emergency time.

Platenghe discloses an information disclosure procedure at an emergency time for each individual assigned by each individual (e.g., abstract, col., 3, lines 12 - 48), the disclosure procedure executing section receives the request for disclosing the information of the specific individual (e.g., abstract, col., 3, lines 12 - 48), with attached information for identifying a normal time and an emergency time (e.g., abstract, col., 3, lines 12 - 48), and executes an information disclosure procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section that matching the information disclosure procedure at a normal time or the information disclosure procedure at an emergency time (e.g., abstract, col., 3, lines 12 - 48), depending on whether the request for disclosing belongs to the normal time or the emergency time (e.g., abstract, col., 3, lines 12 - 48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Turner, Walker, Alisuag, Marchosky and Platenghe in order to facilitate handling of request at an emergency time because the handled request handled

Art Unit: 2154

by an individual would to support accessing the information of an individual during the emergency time. The support of individual for providing necessary help in emergency situations would benefit of having necessary information for managing individual information.

13. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alisuag in view of Marchosky.

14. As per claim 8, Alisuag discloses a method (e.g., paragraph 9, col., 1) for managing information of users (e.g., clients, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) using an information managing device (e.g., usage of servers, figure 3) connected with a network (e.g., usage of internet, figure 3), comprising:

storing information (e.g., usage of memory, paragraph 12, col., 1) of the users (e.g., clients, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) in association with information disclosure items (e.g., usage of fingerprints, passcode etc., paragraph 12, col., 1);

allowing each of the users (e.g., clients, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) to provide an information disclosure procedure (e.g., usage of fingerprint reader etc., paragraph 9, col., 1) necessary to access respective information (e.g., medical information, figure 5) of each of the users (e.g., clients, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1); and

transmitting information (e.g., paragraph 11, col., 1) corresponding to the information disclosure items (paragraph 9, col., 1) of a specific user among the users (e.g., client, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) responsive to an input of an information disclosure procedure (e.g., figure 2, col., 12, col., 1) matching the provided information disclosure procedure (e.g., col., 12, col., 1) corresponding to the specific user (e.g., patient specific authentication information, figure 2).

However, Alisuag does not specifically mention about the items being correspondingly assigned by the users.

Marchosky discloses the well-known concept of the items being correspondingly assigned by the users (paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Alisuag with the teachings of Marchosky in order to facilitate the items being correspondingly assigned by the users because the users would have control on what items to be assigned and what items not to be assigned for the information disclosure procedure. The individual would prepare information disclosure procedure according to his/her own needs which would be used by the information managing device.

15. As per claim 9, Alisuag discloses a method (e.g., paragraph 9, col., 1) for managing information of users (e.g., clients, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) using an information managing device (e.g., usage of servers, figure 3) connected with a network (e.g., usage of internet, figure 3), comprising:

storing information (e.g., usage of memory, paragraph 12, col., 1) of a first user (e.g., client, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) and allowing the first user to provide a corresponding disclosure procedure (e.g., usage of fingerprints, passcode etc., paragraph 12, col., 1) which each item of the information is to be accessed (e.g., medical information, figure 5);

executing a corresponding disclosure procedure (figures 3 and 5, paragraphs 9 and 12, col., 1) provided to an item of the information (figures 3 and 5, paragraphs 9 and 12, col., 1) upon receipt of a request from a second user that satisfies the corresponding disclosure procedure

Art Unit: 2154

provided to the item by the first user (figures 3 and 5, paragraphs 9 and 12, col., 1), and making the item accessible to the second user (figures 3 and 5, paragraphs 9 and 12, col., 1).

However, Alisuag does not specifically mention about the items being assigned in accordance with a selection by a corresponding user and the information disclosure procedure being assigned by the user.

Marchosky discloses the well-known concept of the items being assigned in accordance with a selection by a corresponding user (paragraph 22) and the information disclosure procedure being assigned by the user (paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Alisuag with the teachings of Marchosky in order to facilitate the items being assigned in accordance with a selection by a corresponding user and the information disclosure procedure being assigned by the user because the user would have control on what items to be assigned and what items not to be assigned for the information disclosure procedure. The user would prepare information disclosure procedure according to his/her own needs which would be used for managing information.

16. Claim 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black, 6,539,101 (Hereinafter Black) in view of Marchosky.

17. As per claim 8, Black discloses a method (e.g., paragraph 18, col., 2) for managing information of users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) using an information managing device (e.g., figure 1B) connected with a network (e.g., paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2), comprising:

storing information (e.g., usage of memory, paragraph 121, col., 9) of the users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) in association with information disclosure items (e.g., usage of fingerprints, voiceprint etc., paragraph 11, col., 1, paragraph 109, col., 9);

allowing each of the users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) to provide an information disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraph 28, col., 3) necessary to access respective information (e.g., paragraph 26, col., 3) of each of the users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2); and

transmitting information corresponding to the information disclosure items (e.g., paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2) of a specific user among the users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) responsive to an input of an information disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraphs 26, 27, col., 3) matching the provided information disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraph 21, col., 2) corresponding to the specific user (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2).

However, Black does not specifically mention about the items being correspondingly assigned by the users.

Marchosky discloses the well-known concept of the items being correspondingly assigned by the users (paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Black with the teachings of Marchosky in order to facilitate the items being correspondingly assigned by the users because the users would have control on what items to be assigned and what items not to be assigned for the information disclosure procedure. The individual would prepare information disclosure procedure according to his/her own needs, which would be used by the information managing device.

Art Unit: 2154

18. As per claim 9, Black discloses a method (e.g., paragraph 18, col., 2) for managing information of users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) using an information managing device (e.g., figure 1B) connected with a network (e.g., paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2), comprising:

storing information (e.g., paragraph 121, col., 9) of a first user (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) and allowing the first user to provide a corresponding disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) for accessing each item of the information (e.g., paragraph 26, col., 3),

executing a corresponding disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2, paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2, paragraph 121, col., 9, paragraph 28, col., 3, paragraph 26, col., 3, figure 1B) provided to an item of the information (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2, paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2, paragraph 121, col., 9, paragraph 28, col., 3, paragraph 26, col., 3, figure 1B) upon receipt of a request from a second user that satisfies the corresponding disclosure procedure provided to the item by the first user (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2, paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2, paragraph 121, col., 9, paragraph 28, col., 3, paragraph 26, col., 3, figure 1B), and making the item accessible to the second user (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2, paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2, paragraph 121, col., 9, paragraph 28, col., 3, paragraph 26, col., 3, figure 1B).

However, Black does not specifically mention about the items being define in accordance based on a selection by a corresponding user (first user) and the information disclosure procedure being used by the user.

Art Unit: 2154

Marchosky discloses the well-known concept of the items being defined in accordance with a selection by a corresponding user (paragraph 22) and the information disclosure procedure being assigned by the user (paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Black with the teachings of Marchosky in order to facilitate the items being defined in accordance with a selection by a corresponding user (first user) and the information disclosure procedure being assigned by the user because the user would have control on what items to be assigned and what items not to be assigned for the information disclosure procedure. The user would prepare information disclosure procedure according to his/her own needs, which would be used for managing information and accessible to other users.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the


Art Unit: 2154

claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 Haresh Patel

Haresh Patel

July 24, 2005